Ham-Policy Digest   Fri, 18 Mar 94   Volume 94 : Issue 139

Today's Topics:
    How can I *LEGALLY* change my Ham radio to send/receive Marine B

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Wed, 16 Mar 1994 20:50:15 GMT
From: catfish!cscsun!dtiller@uunet.uu.net
Subject: How can I *LEGALLY* change my Ham radio to send/receive Marine B
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Dan Pickersgill (dan@mystis.wariat.org) wrote:

: "No provision of these rules prevents the use of any amateur station
: of ANY MEANS OF RADIOCOMMUNICATIONS at its disposal..."

: Sounds pretty all inclusive to me. "ANY MEANS OF RADIOCOMMUNICATIONS"
: would seem to me to imply any equipment or frequency that the said
: amateur could gain access to by ANY means.

I gotta agree with Dan. It would have said "No provision of this
SECTION or PART or SUBPART...." if it had meant amateur rules only.
"Rules" implies all of Title 47.
--
David Tiller | Network Administrator | Voice: (804) 752-3710 |
dtiller@rmc.edu | Randolph-Macon College| Fax: (804) 752-7231 |
"Drunk, [Beowulf] slew | P.O. Box 5005 | ICBM: 37d 42' 43.75" N |
no hearth companions." | Ashland, Va 23005 | 77d 31' 32.19" W |

```
-----------------------------

Date: Thu, 17 Mar 1994 06:22:43 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!galaxy.ucr.edu!library.ucla.edu!csulb.edu!csus.edu!
netcom.com!netcomsv!bongo!julian@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2381e6d6@swedx.ct.se>, <181@ted.win.net>,
<CMqz0t.IG9@eecs.nwu.edu>ulb.
Subject : Re: HMS Carlskrona

In article <CMqz0t.IG9@eecs.nwu.edu> hpa@nwu.edu (H. Peter Anvin) writes:
>In article <181@ted.win.net> of rec.radio.amateur.policy,
>  mjsilva@ted.win.net (Michael Silva) writes:
>>
>> In article <2381e6d6@swedx.ct.se>, Hermod Pedersen
(hermod.pedersen@swedx.ct.se) writes:
>> >The Swedish navy's school ship HMS Carlskrona is out on its yearly voyage
>> >around the globe. Aboard is as usual several hams. The ships signals can be
>> >caught primarily on CW, using these frequencies:
>>         ^^^^^^^^^^^^^^
>>
>> And I thought the Swedes were so progressive!  Dan P. et al, please
>> straighten these folks out ;-)
>>
>Actually Swedish licensing requirements are pretty CW-heavy if you
>want HF privileges, or if you want any significant power.  By the time
>I left Sweden there were four classes:
>
>T - 75 W - no HF privs
>    -> Morse code not required, theory same as for class A
                   ^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^
>    -> min age: 17

 Well lookie here you geezers. Those progressive Swedes have a
no-code licence. What is even more shocking is that they had it 25
years ago while you were still flopping around arguing about incentive
licencing.

 So, yes, you are right, the Swedes are progressive and the
U.S. is a couple of decades behind.

--
Julian Macassey, N6ARE  julian@bongo.tele.com Voice: (310) 659-3366
Paper Mail: Apt 225, 975 Hancock Ave, West Hollywood, California 90069-4074

-----------------------------
```

Date: Thu, 17 Mar 1994 06:52:51 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1994Mar14.182516.8742@enterprise.rdd.lmsc.lockheed.co,
<CSLE87-140394165910@145.1.114.19>, <xmxNQww.edellers@delphi.com>
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)
Subject : Re: Coord. priority for open repeaters

In article <xmxNQww.edellers@delphi.com> Ed Ellers <edellers@delphi.com> writes:
>Karl Beckman <CSLE87> writes:
>>
>>If I was allowed one single change in the present rules, I would require
>>that ALL repeater stations _MUST_ utilize tone-coded squelch on their
>>receivers and transmitters.
>
>We have a couple of open machines in Louisville (such as the RACES repeater on
>147.03) that use CTCSS; the RACES machine automatically announces its PL at
>intervals when it IDs. (Both of these are using 151.4 Hz.)
>
>There's a problem with requiring CTCSS, though -- what happens to older rigs,
>particularly HTs, that don't have CTCSS? Do we have to junk them? I'm much
>happier with the idea of using CTCSS only when there is a "situation" between
>two adjacent repeaters on the same pair (or, of course, on closed systems).

Postage stamp sized CTCSS encoders are available from Circuit Specialists
that can be added to any rig, even a Regency HR-2. My machine has CTCSS,
118.8, but it's used in a somewhat unusual way. It's ORed with carrier
squelch, but carrier squelch is set *really* tight. If you don't have CTCSS,
you can still get in if you have a strong signal at the repeater. If you
have CTCSS, the repeater will follow you right on down into the noise
floor. It's set up that way to prevent miscellaneous crud from kerchunking
the repeater all day and all night at its high RF site. The machine also
outputs CTCSS so people with intermod prone radios don't have to listen
to cat fights while monitoring the inactive repeater frequency if their
radios have CTCSS decode.

Gary
--
Gary Coffman KE4ZV | You make it, | gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems | we break it. | uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way | Guaranteed! | emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244 | |

Date: 17 Mar 94 06:34:05 GMT

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!darkstar.UCSC.EDU!nic.scruz.net!cruzio!comix!
jeffl@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1994Mar10.171053.24169@cs.brown.edu>, <780@comix.UUCP>,
<2m2f2e$c6f@hpbab.mentorg.com>f
Subject : Re: Morse Whiners

In article <2m2f2e$c6f@hpbab.mentorg.com> Hank_Oredson@mentorg.com writes:
>In article <780@comix.UUCP>, jeffl@comix.UUCP (Jeff Liebermann) writes:

>|> The typical automobile drivers licence exam tests "competence".
>|> Yet, the idiots, drunks, and maniacs still pass the exam and kill.
>"Kill others" is the keyword here, who cares if they kill themselves?

The drivers exam was instituted because the state decided that
the public safety would be best served by not putting the idiots,
drunks, and maniacs in the position of having to decide whether they
were going to kill only themselves or take a few taxpayers with them.
The analogy also applies to radio. It's very difficult to jam a
frequency and only affect oneself.

>As long as they don't electrocute others ... or destroy my radio ...
Exactly. As a result of bad experiences, I don't loan out my
truck, my guns, my chain saw, or my radios. With the modern
transistorized radios, it's fairly difficult to kill onself with
a radio. However, back my days of playing service tech with tube,
dynamotor power supplies, and high voltage, we would kill off about
one tech a year in Los Angeles.

>|> I've seen too many hams that literally cannot program their own
>|> handheld.
>Good idea! We could test them on VCR programming also.
I can't tell if you're serious or not. I am. We have a few bicycle
charity rides in Santa Cruz where hams do some of the safety traffic.
Many of the licenced hams showed an apparent lack of practice in
operating the push to talk switch much less the frequency selector.
Programming was a lost cause. One fellow kept calling over and over
on the wrong frequency because he did not understand what the funny
numbers on the dial meant. These are NOT complete idiots but
intelligent people that have little or no practice or instruction
in operating any radio much less their own. I would like to give
them (and myself) a fighting chance before letting them loose on the
airwaves. I help where I can.

>to operate! A reasonable knowledge of classic literature should
>also be required - don't you find those uneducated folks boring?
Nope. I learn from everyone and everything. Actually, you may

have a good idea. It would be nice if a working knowledge of
English were required of a ham licence. Some of the 10 minute
monologues I've heard are truely boring. One of my bad habits
is to count the number of "you-know-what-I-mean" fillers and
report them back to the perpetrator. Perhaps forensics or elocution
might help?

>|> If the effort wasted in learning CW were re-directed to learning
>|> theory, operation, or common courtesy, methinks we would have a
>|> much better grade of ham.

>We would?
>What evidence do you have of this?
>Perhaps the Morse-challenged denizens of the average 2M repeater?

I have no evidence. Similarly, I haven't seen any evidence that
the morse code requirement has improved ham radio in any way. Given
a limited and reasonable time to prepare for an ENTRY LEVEL exam, my
humble and unfounded opinion favors the use of technical expertise or
operational instruction as an alternative filter to morse code.

I pass no judgement on the value of morse code, only the RELATIVE
value of instruction in code versus theory. I also don't suggest
that technical competance will provide any relief from hams that
apparently suffer from personality disorders and inflict themselves
upon the world via ham radio. I still have this twisted illusion
that ham radio is a technical hobby that promotes learning,
technical advancement, and general competance. Perhaps not.

>"Hey, dit-dit good buddy!"
Roger, that's a big 10-4. I got started in CB 30 years ago.

Incidentally, the surest indication of success is crowding and
pollution. By this definition, ham radio is a success.

--
Jeff Liebermann   Box 272   1540 Jackson Ave   Ben Lomond   CA   95005
408.336.2558 voice wb6ssy@ki6eh.#nocal.ca.usa wb6ssy.ampr.org [44.4.18.10]
408.699.0483 digital_pager   73557,2074 cis [don't]
jeffl@comix.santa-cruz.ca.us   scruz.ucsc.edu!comix!jeffl

Date: Wed, 16 Mar 1994 16:00:31 -0600
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!math.ohio-state.edu!news.acns.nwu.edu!ftpbox!mothost!
lmpsbbs!NewsWatcher!user@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <p42vYIo.edellers@delphi.com>, <61J0ic6w165w@mystis.wariat.org>,
<2m6vor$47g@ccnet.ccnet.com>psb
Subject : Re: Coord. priority for open repeaters

In article <2m6vor$47g@ccnet.ccnet.com>, rwilkins@ccnet.com (Bob Wilkins
n6fri) wrote:

> Dan Pickersgill (dan@mystis.wariat.org) wrote:
> : Ed Ellers <edellers@delphi.com> writes:
>
> : > Does that mean that it's legal to operate simplex on the output of a closed
> : > repeater -- if and when that repeater is not in use -- and/or that repeater
> : > users have to wait for the simplex ops to clear?
>
> : Somewhere around here I have a notice from the FCC stating that they
> : interpret the band plan as 'good amateur practice,' thus it carries the
> : force of Part 97 (all hams being required to follow good amateur
> : practice). This means using simplex FM on a repeater pair is a violation
> : of that section of Part 97. (Or at least that was what I remember from
> : that FCC notice.)

Actually, Dan, if I remember that one correctly, it applied to operating
simplex on the INPUT of a repeater that was set up in accordance with
the standard band plan. Running simplex on the output did not key the
repeater unnecessarily, thus causing interference on the output side.
And yes, we certainly do agree on a few things!

>
> : Dan N8PKV
>
> The practice of talking on the output frequency by -members- of that
> repeater is a common way of car to car or local handie chat. The repeater
> takes precedence over simplex as most users of the repeater can not hear
> the simplex qso in progress. I consider this good amateur practice. Why
> take up additional spectrum for a qso that is not intended for a wide
> area. This way you can always monitor the repeater at the same time.
>
> How many simplex fm frequencies are in your local 440 band plan? There are
> only three in northern california. 441.000 446.000 446.500 MHz
>
> Bob
>
>
> --
>   Bob Wilkins   work   bwilkins@cave.org
> Berkeley, California   home   rwilkins@ccnet.com
>   94701-0710   play   n6fri@n6eeg.#nocal.usa.noam

Bob, my comment above (if memory has not failed me) should cover it. One
thing I always recommend is transmitting with a DIFFERENT CTCSS or CSQ
and ALWAYS listening CSQ if you run simplex within the repeater output
window. That way you won't bother too many folks and those amateurs with
the scanners do know you are out there.

--
Karl Beckman, P.E.   < STUPIDITY is an elemental force for which >
Motorola Comm - Fixed Data < no earthquake is a match. -- Karl Kraus >

The statements and opinions expressed here are not those of Motorola Inc.
Motorola paid a marketing firm a huge sum of money to get their opinions;
they have made it clear that they do not wish to share those of employees.

Amateur radio WA8NVW @ K8MR.NEOH.USA.NA   NavyMARS VBH @ NOGBN.NOASI

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #139
****
****